

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TERRY R. COCHRANE,	)	3:11-cv-00092-LRH-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	January 28, 2013
	)	
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN	)	
POLICE DEPARTMENT, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: Katie Lynn Ogden REPORTER: FTR

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Terry R. Cochrane, In Pro Per (Telephonically)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS: Thomas D. Dillard, Esq.

**MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS: Motion Hearing**

3:33 p.m. Court Convenes.

The court addresses plaintiff's Motion to Hold Thomas D. Dillard Attorney in Contempt (Dkt. #114) and Defendants' Response thereto (Dkt. # 116). The court notes that it has not received plaintiff's reply to defendants' response to the instant motion, nor is a reply memo entered in the docket. Mr. Dillard indicates that he received plaintiff reply on January 25, 2013. The court therefore requests that the plaintiff proceed with his argument with regard to his motion for contempt.

Mr. Cochrane indicates that defendants' supplemental production (Dkt. # 110) included several documents which he claims are illegible and/or Xerox copies of documents that were faded to the point it was difficult to read or see the dates of the documents. Mr. Cochrane states that he sent Mr. Dillard a letter concerning the inadequate discovery responses he received. Mr. Cochrane informs the court that he also requested supplemental discovery which included "clear" copies of documents that were not faded and for specific dates of grievances. He also requested a signed, notarized, copy of his deposition (see Dkt. #114, Exhibit B). Mr. Cochrane explains that defendants' production of documents as ordered by the court included around 400 plus pages of documents that range between ten (10) to fifteen (15) year time frame. Mr. Cochrane notes that some of defendant's responses indicated that documents have either been lost or misfiled. Mr. Cochrane states that such responses to discovery are inadequate and gives reason why he is filing the instant motion for contempt against defendants' counsel, attorney Thomas Dillard.

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Katie Lynn Ogden, Deputy Clerk